REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are all the claims pending in the application. Claims 1-6 and 13-20 are cancelled. New claims 21-26 are added. Claims 9 and 12 are amended to correct their dependency.

As a preliminary matter, Applicants note that in the Office Action Summary, the Examiner indicates that claims 1, 2 and 4-20 are rejected, and claim 3 is allowed. However, the detailed rejections at pages 2-10 of the Office Action contain **NO statement of rejection** for claims 7-12. Thus, Applicants assume that claims 3 and 7-12 are allowable. To the extent that the Examiner newly rejects claims 7-12, a Non-Final Office Action is requested.

Priority

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's concise statement of the claim for priority and the Examiner's acknowledgment of receipt of the certified copies of the relevant documents.

Specification

Applicants have checked the specification and have not found any errors. To the extent that the Examiner identifies any errors, they will be corrected.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112, 1st

Claims 6 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

The rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of claims 6 and 19. No new claims refer to a solvate. However, Applicants respectfully note that the solvates or hydrates of a compound often have the same pharmaceutical activity as the compound.

Claims 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

First, the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of the rejected claims.

Second, Applicants note that the Examiner asserts that the specification, while being enabling for treating impotence, does not reasonably provide enablement for the prevention impotence, nor the treating or prevention of frigidity.

However Applicants have redrafted the cancelled claims in the form of new claims 22-26, and have focused these claims on the " treatment of impotence. "

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112, 2nd

Claims 13-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

First, the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of the rejected claims.

Second, the Examiner rejects the claims because they recite the limitation "pharmaceutical" in the beginning of the claims. The Examiner asserts that there is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claims.

Applicants note that the reference to "pharmaceutical" is present at page 24 of the original specification, where the "Industrial Applicability" of the invention is recited. Furthermore, the specification teaches at pages 1 and 2 that existing pharmaceuticals have deficiencies and the remainder of the specification teaches the compounds that are improvements over the known pharmaceuticals. Thus, one skilled in the art would know that the compounds disclosed in great detail in the specification can be used as pharmaceuticals.

Nonetheless, Applicants have drafted the new claims to recite only compounds and have avoided the phrase "pharmaceutical."

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Baoshun et. al. (WO 2003016313) in view of Graver Tank & Mfq. Co. v. The Linde Air Products Co., (USSC 1950) 339 US 695, 85 USPQ 328. This rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

First, the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of the rejected claims.

Second, Applicants note that the Examiner observes that the current application recites a variety of specific novel substituted pyrazolopyrimidinethione compounds and compositions that can be used as phosphodiesterase V inhibitors, and further observes that these compounds all contain a pyrazolopyrimidinethione core with various substitutents. However, the Examiner finds the subject matter of claim 3 to be allowable.

Applicants have placed claim 3 into independent form by redrafting the claim as new claim 21. This claim would be patentable for the reasons given by the Examiner.

Double patenting

The Examiner asserts that, should claim 13, 15, or 17 be found allowable, claim 14, 16, 18, or 19 will be objected to respectively under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. This objection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

First, the rejection is moot in view of the cancellation of the rejected claims.

Second, as to the new dependent claims 22-26, the compositions of pharmaceutically acceptable salts of the compounds and/or the compounds covered in claim 3 for treating impotence are retained.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 3 is allowed. The Examiner's statement of reasons for allowance is noted by Applicants.

Conclusion

The inventive compounds and their salts, which were originally covered in Claim 3, are now covered in new claim 21. A technologist skilled in this art would know that the compounds in claim 21 have identical pharmacological properties with their salts. Synthesis of their salts has been disclosed in the specification. Thus, their salts should also be allowed. Specifically, compositions of pharmaceutically acceptable salts of compounds and/or compounds covered in claim 3 for treating impotence should be allowed and are presented in new claims 22-26.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

/Alan J. Kasper/

Alan J. Kasper
Registration No. 25,426

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860
WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: February 28, 2008